

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

			,	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/816,927	03/23/2001	Heinrich Brunner	GR 98 P 2651 P	6167
7:	590 11/18/2003		EXAM	INER
LERNER AND GREENBERG, P.A.			ROSE, KIESHA L	
Post Office Box Hollywood, FI			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			2822	
			DATE MAILED: 11/18/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/816,927	AUERBACH ET AL.					
,, ,	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Kiesha L. Rose	2822					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ars on the cover sheet with the	orrespondenc add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 15 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applic 1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	ply to a cation in				
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]							
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	f the final rejection.					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extending the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in				
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:						
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE:							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):						
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely file	d amendment				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NO	OT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: none							
Claim(s) objected to: none.							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> .							
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme							
10. Other:	ZARABIAN Y PATENT EXAMINER DGY CENTER 2800						

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments filed are not found to be persuasive as stated in the previous office action filed 18 July 2003, which stated that the Nishizawa reference does disclose channel regions that surround the semiconductor body and semiconductor regions. Therefore the rejection stands.